

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **September 16, 2003** the Examiner reviewed claims 1-30. Claims 1, 11, and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Windhouwer et al. ("Acoi: A System for Indexing Multimedia Objects", hereinafter "Windhouwer"). Claims 2-3, 12-13, and 22-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Windhouwer further in view of Nielsen (USPN 5,899,975, hereinafter "Nielson"). Claims 4, 14, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Windhouwer further in view of Burrows (USPN 6,067,543, hereinafter "Burrows"). Claims 5, 15, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Windhouwer further in view of Miller (USPN 6,119,120, hereinafter "Miller"). Claims 6, 16, and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Windhouwer further in view of Imanaka (USPN 5,471,677, hereinafter "Imanaka"). Claims 7, 17, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Windhouwer. Claims 8, 18, and 28 were rejected as being unpatentable over Windhouwer further in view of Messely et al. (USPN 6,076,051, hereinafter "Messely"). Claims 9, 19, and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Windhouwer further in view of Swift (USPN 5,710,978, hereinafter "Swift"). Claims 10, 20, and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Windhouwer further in view of Vora et al. (USPN 5,819,273, hereinafter "Vora").

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent claims 1, 11, and 21 were rejected as being anticipated by Windhouwer and dependent claims 5, 15, and 25 were rejected as being unpatentable over Windhouwer further in view of Miller. Applicant respectfully points out that Miller teaches **including additional block indexing information** in an index to facilitate searching the index (see Miller, col. 4, lines 37-53).

In contrast, the present invention discloses specifying **sections of the document to skip** while creating the index (see page 9, lines 1-8 of the instant application). Including additional

block indexing information is not the same as specifying sections of the document to skip while creating the index. Specifying sections of the document to skip is beneficial because it allows the system to entirely skip sections of the document, thereby not using any system resources to index those sections of the document. Whereas, including additional block indexing information in an index (as in Miller) causes the system to include all sections of the document thereby using additional system resources.


Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 11, and 21 to include the limitations of dependent claims 5, 15, and 25, respectively. These amendments find support on page 9, lines 1-8 of the instant application. Claims 5, 15, and 25 have been canceled without prejudice. Applicant has also amended independent claim 21 to correct a typographical error. No new matter has been added.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 11, and 21 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-4 and 6-10, which depend upon claim 1, claims 12-14 and claims 16-20, which depend upon claim 11, and claims 22-24 and 26-30, which depend upon claim 21 are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Edward J. Grundler
Reg. No. 47,615

Date: October 6, 2003

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
508 Second Street, Suite 201
Davis, CA 95616-4692
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665